



# Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

Before the Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

To: Office of the Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, DC 2055  
September 28, 2016 Via E-mail-Electronic Filing

**Comment Filed by: GUARDS (Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space)**

In the Matter of:

COMMENT SOUGHT ON STREAMLINING )  
DEPLOYMENT OF SMALL CELL INFRASTRUCTURE ) WT Docket No. 16-421  
BY IMPROVING WIRELESS FACILITIES SITING POLICIES; )  
MOBILITIE, LLC PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RULING )

Dear Ms. Dortch,

We are writing in opposition to the proposal to streamline the approval process for small cell distributed antenna infrastructure. The FCC cites their mission to promote wireless infrastructure to justify this Docket aimed at preempting local authority to force municipalities to allow expedited deployment of 5G in their communities without safety testing or environmental review.

The FCC would do well to remember that they were not just charged with expediting the deployment of wireless. They were also charged to “prescribe and make effective rules regarding the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions” (TCA, 104 Pub. L. 104). This has not been done, as discussed below the rules are outdated and inapplicable. The FCC must not force further exposure to wireless radiation complying only with limits that three Federal Agencies (The U.S. National Toxicology Program, The Environmental Protection Agency, and The Department of Interior) say are not protective of health or the environment during the chronic non-thermal population-wide non-consenting exposures everyone experiences today. The FCC is in the process of updating the wireless radiation exposure limits. Until the FCC completes revision of the FCC radiofrequency (RF) radiation limits so that they are population-based biologically-protective RF radiation limits, the FCC is in violation of their Congressional delegated responsibility to adopt “uniform, consistent requirements, with adequate safeguards of the public health and safety” these were to be “established as soon as possible” (H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94). No further preemption of local authority should be undertaken until the FCC has promulgated safety limits for wireless radiation that protect people and the environment during today’s ubiquitous chronic and involuntary exposures.

5G is a more radiation intensive technology than previous wireless technologies, necessitating an extensive wireless network and community and countrywide saturation with very high frequency (mm range) RF radiation in order for 5G to function ([https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/DOC-339920A1.pdf](https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-339920A1.pdf)) According to

Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

Chairman Wheeler himself, “5G buildout is going to be very infrastructure intensive, requiring a massive deployment of small cells.” and “Current blocks of licensed low-band spectrum are usually 5 to 10 MHz in width. With 5G, however, we are looking at blocks of at least 200 MHz in width.”

Due to the documented harmful effects of RF radiation exposure on human health and the environment, any project which would increase these exposures necessitates a full NEPA review and EIS. Implementation of 5G would also violate the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, several sections of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, and International Human Rights Law in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and implementation should therefore be halted.

GUARDS is an international coalition against global WiFi from space, a technology that endangers all life on Earth. Wireless connections and transmissions use **pulse-modulated electromagnetic microwave radiation** at low intensity levels. These have been shown by multiple peer-reviewed studies to cause serious adverse bioeffects - genetic, neurological, physiological and psychological damage (<http://www.mainecoalitiontostopsmartmeters.org/?p=1469>). As the evidence of harm continues to mount, between 1993-2013 more than 81 governments and organizations world-wide have banned or warned about the hazards of wireless technology ([http://www.cellphonetaskforce.org/?page\\_id=128](http://www.cellphonetaskforce.org/?page_id=128)).

On May 27, 2016, the U.S. National Toxicology Program announced that non-thermal RF radiation from cellphones is carcinogenic. This finding is consistent with epidemiological studies and other toxicology studies. Yet, 5G will make this exposure ubiquitous and inescapable.

There are legal implications related to irradiating entire countries and their citizens without informed consent. Strong correlations exist between RF radiation exposure from wireless technologies, increasing rates of Radiofrequency Sickness and many cancers. In several countries (Italy, France, Spain, Australia), plaintiffs have gone beyond correlation to successfully prove causation, and damages have been awarded by the courts. The insurance industry currently recognizes the immense risks of insuring companies against radiofrequency injury claims, and coverage from the major firms like Lloyds and Swiss Re is no longer available.

## **NEPA and Environmental Review**

Implementation of 5G is a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment; as such, a NEPA review is triggered. NEPA is not limited to specific projects and FCC approval of 5G rules as well as the dockets herein constitute “major Federal actions.” The potential environmental and human health hazards from 5G necessitates a comprehensive NEPA review [*Envtl. Def. Fund v. Tenn. Valley Auth.*, 468 F.2d 1164, 1174 (6th Cir. 1972)] and, specifically, a formal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS should include a full review of environmental effects, as well as human health and safety. The FCC has an obligation to evaluate whether “*services or capabilities are essential to public health, safety, or in the public interest*” (H.R. Report No. 104-204, p. 94) and so must protect the public from possible harm caused by radiofrequency radiation.

The FCC is not entitled to essentially disregard comments that do not provide global cost-benefit analysis (*Scenic Hudson v. Federal Power Commission*). The Commission has an affirmative duty to inquire into and consider all relevant facts. The FCC must use government resources to perform the relevant analysis. The FCC should request the EPA use its National Risk Management Research Laboratory resources and experts to conduct all cost analyses necessary.

This proposal also triggers the need for a Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Executive Order 13186 concerning effects on migratory birds.

# RF Radiation - Environmentally Harmful and a Public Health Hazard

## Environmental Impacts

### U.S. Department of Interior States: Current Radiation Standards Inapplicable

On February 7, 2014, the U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) stated, “*the electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today,*” in reference to the current limits governing radiation utilized by WiFi. The DOI letter discusses a number of studies in which birds appear harmed by low-level RF radiation associated with cell towers and other wireless technologies

([http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us\\_doi\\_comments.pdf](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us_doi_comments.pdf)). Furthermore, DOI required FirstNet to undergo a comprehensive NEPA review and planning program. Implementation of 5G which will have similar widespread impacts must do so as well.

### RF radiation kills and damages trees

Trees and other vegetation are being killed and damaged across the U.S. and world-wide even without full-scale implementation of 5G. RF radiation is being implicated as the cause. Several studies show the very serious effects that RF radiation has on the health of trees. Trees, agricultural crops and other plants are essential to the welfare of the global environment and the continuation of the human race. Decimation of the amazon rainforest by direct human actions has been oft-cited as endangering the global environment, the FCC should not be moving forward with implementing a technology (5G wireless), that will hasten the RF caused death of our urban and rural forests, cropland and other vegetation and associated insect/pollinator life. Please read the following papers to see the toll RF is already taking on trees. We cannot afford additional forest die-off. Large mature trees are being seriously damaged and killed, this damage will take 50 years or more to repair.

- Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017\\_Radiofrequency\\_radiation\\_injures\\_trees\\_around\\_mobile\\_phone\\_base\\_stations](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306435017_Radiofrequency_radiation_injures_trees_around_mobile_phone_base_stations)
- Adverse Influence of Radio Frequency Background on Trembling Aspen Seedlings: Preliminary Observations  
<https://www.hindawi.com/journals/ijfr/2010/836278/>
- Review: Weak radiofrequency radiation exposure from mobile phone radiation on plants.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27650031?dopt=Abstract>
- Tree damage in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations <http://kompetenzinitiative.net/KIT/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Tree-damages-in-the-vicinity-of-mobile-phone-base-stations.pdf>
- The trees make it easy to recognize the effects of RF-EMF. Examples of tree damage:  
<http://kompetenzinitiative.net/KIT/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Trees-in-Bamberg-and-Hallstadt-Documentation-2006-2016.pdf>
- Electromagnetic Fields Act Similarly in Plants as in Animals: Probably Activation of Calcium Channels via Their Voltage Sensor: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3780531/>

### RF radiation kills and impairs reproduction of wildlife

A parade of studies continue to be published implicating wireless technology in the demise of frogs, bats, and honey bees, the threatened extinction of the house sparrow, and damage to the DNA of the human species. It is vital to the continuation of life that large parts of Earth are spared the incessant radiation that accompanies

Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

wireless technologies.

- “The Report on Possible Impacts of Communication Towers on Wildlife Including Birds and Bees” commissioned on 30th August 2010 by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India [http://www.moef.nic.in/downloads/public-information/final\\_mobile\\_towers\\_report.pdf](http://www.moef.nic.in/downloads/public-information/final_mobile_towers_report.pdf)
- “Impacts of radio-frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) from cell phone towers and wireless devices on biosystem and ecosystem – a review,” [http://www.biolmedonline.com/Articles/Vol4\\_4\\_2012/Vol4\\_4\\_202-216\\_BM-8.pdf](http://www.biolmedonline.com/Articles/Vol4_4_2012/Vol4_4_202-216_BM-8.pdf)
- Balmori, A. “Electromagnetic pollution from phone masts. Effects on wildlife,” *Pathophysiology* (2009), doi:10.1016/j.pathophys.2009.01.007 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19264463>
- October 31, 2014 presentation to the Manitoba Entomological Society, reviewing 91 studies on the effects of RF/MW radiation on honey bees, insects, birds, etc: [https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/mobilfunk\\_newsletter/0RUPGTI4qQY](https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/mobilfunk_newsletter/0RUPGTI4qQY)
- A BRIEFING MEMORANDUM: What We Know, Can Infer, and Don’t Yet Know about Impacts from Thermal and Non-thermal Non-ionizing Radiation to Birds and Other Wildlife — for Public Release July 14, 2016. Albert M. Manville, II, Ph.D., C.W.B. <http://www.mainecoalitiontostopsmartmeters.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Manville-7-14-2016-Radiation-Briefing-Memo-Public.pdf>

### Wireless Technology is Energy-hogging and Unsustainable

Contrary to popular perception, wireless technology is neither a sustainable nor environmentally-friendly technology because wireless connectivity uses far more energy than wired connectivity. According to *Energy Consumption in Wired and Wireless Access Networks*, “**Wireless technologies will continue to consume at least 10 times more power than wired technologies** when providing comparable access rates and traffic volumes. PON [passive optical networks] will continue to be the most energy-efficient access technology.” (<http://people.eng.unimelb.edu.au/rtucker/publications/files/energy-wired-wireless.pdf>), even as technology becomes more energy efficient. A higher amount of energy is consumed in transmitting large amounts of information through the air (a medium that has high resistance and high level of signal absorption) compared to transmission via various corded communication connections (e.g., copper or fiber optic based). In fact, in a paper looking at the energy consumption of cloud computing, the authors state, “**Our energy calculations show that by 2015, wireless cloud will consume up to 43 TWh**, compared to only 9.2 TWh in 2012, an increase of 460%. This is an increase in carbon footprint from 6 megatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2012 to up to 30 megatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2015, the equivalent of adding 4.9 million cars to the roads. Up to 90% of this consumption is attributable to wireless access network technologies, data centres account for only 9%.” (<http://www.ceet.unimelb.edu.au/publications/ceet-white-paper-wireless-cloud.pdf>)

While the article discusses cloud computing as though it is an energy saver, it is clear from the discussion that those energy savings are only realized if the cloud replaces individual computing power. Otherwise, cloud computing only causes additional energy consumption and should not be promoted as an environmentally-friendly technology. The energy wastefulness of wireless technology should cause the FCC serious pause in its promotion of wireless technology. So should the very serious health and environmental effects of the RF radiation wireless technology emits.

### United Nations Rio Declaration on Environment and Development

The Precautionary Principle as drawn up in Rio in 1992 - the Rio Declaration: <http://www.gdrc.org/u-gov/precaution-7.html>

Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space  
[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.

Principle 15 codified for the first time at the global level the precautionary approach, which indicates lack of scientific certainty is no reason to postpone action to avoid potentially serious or irreversible harm to the environment. Central to principle 15 is the element of anticipation, reflecting a requirement that effective environmental measures need to be based upon actions which take a long-term approach and which might anticipate changes on the basis of scientific knowledge.

### **From the U.N. General Assembly: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly July 2012 66/288 The Future We Want**

We recognize the importance of strengthening international, regional and national capacities in research and technology assessment, especially in view of the rapid development and possible deployment of new technologies that may also have unintended negative impacts, in particular on biodiversity and health, or other unforeseen consequences.

[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/66/288&Lang=E](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/66/288&Lang=E)

An ETC Group Press Release UN Moves Towards an Early Listening System shares: “*The decision paves the way for a badly needed early warning system on the impacts of new technologies*” and explains:

ETC Group proposed the creation of a technology assessment capacity in the UN in the lead up to the 2012 Rio Summit. At that time, the proposal was backed by the G-77 and China and a few OECD states such as Sweden and Norway. The Summit concluded with a surprisingly strong call for technology assessment from local to global levels warning that new technologies could pose significant health and environmental risks.

<http://www.etcgroup.org/content/un-moves-towards-technology-early-listening-system>

And from *The Lancet*:

Planetary health is a new science that is only beginning to draw the coordinates of its interests and concerns. It demands new coalitions and partnerships across many different disciplines to meet the pervasive knowledge failures identified by this Commission. It demands new attention to governance and implementation. And, perhaps most of all, it demands more creative imagination among scientists and practitioners working in health—redefining the meaning of human progress, rethinking the possibilities for human cooperation, and revitalizing the prospects for the health of human civilizations. (par 7)

and

Second, planetary health concerns the natural systems within which our species exists—for example, the health and diversity of the biosphere. Human beings live within a safe operating space of planetary existence. If the boundaries of that space are breached, the conditions for our survival will be diminished." Currently, natural systems are being degraded to an extent unprecedented in history, with known and as yet unknown and unquantified effects on human health. (par 2)

[http://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lancet/PIIS0140-6736\(15\)61038-8.pdf](http://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lancet/PIIS0140-6736(15)61038-8.pdf)

## **Human Health Impacts**

### **U.S. National Toxicology Program: Radiation from Cellphones Carcinogenic**

The U.S. National Toxicology Program released results showing that exposure to non-thermal levels of pulse-modulated microwave radiation causes cancer, specifically intracardiac schwannomas and malignant gliomas, and breaks DNA (<http://ehtrust.org/science/facts-national-toxicology-program-cellphone-rat-cancer-study/>).

**Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space**

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)



Epidemiological data show that the rate of glioblastoma multiforme of the brain, a malignant type of glioma, is increasing (<http://microwavenews.com/news-center/ntp-and-brain-tumor-rates>). Obviously the results of this study support an immediate halt to the implementation of 5G pending safety evaluation.

### **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: FCC Wireless Radiation Limits Irrelevant**

“The FCC's current exposure guidelines, as well as those of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection, **are thermally based, and do not apply to chronic, nonthermal exposure situations**. They are believed to protect against injury that may be caused by acute exposures that result in tissue heating or electric shock and burn. The hazard level (for frequencies generally at or greater than 3 MHz) is based on a specific absorption dose-rate, SAR, associated with an effect that results from an increase in body temperature. The FCC's exposure guideline **is considered protective of effects arising from a thermal mechanism but not from all possible mechanisms**. Therefore, the generalization by many that the guidelines protect human beings from harm by any or all mechanisms is not justified.” (emphasis added) ([http://www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case\\_law/docs/noi\\_epa\\_response.pdf](http://www.emrpolicy.org/litigation/case_law/docs/noi_epa_response.pdf))

### **FCC Investigation of Current Exposure Limits Underway**

With the FCC finally beginning re-evaluation of current irrelevant and obsolete non-ionizing RF exposure guidelines, it seems imprudent to move forward with implementing 5G, a technology encouraging global proliferation of RF microwave radiation. This evaluation should be completed prior to implementing 5G.

In the Inquiry the FCC requests comment to determine whether its RF exposure limits and policies need to be reassessed. Since consideration of the limits themselves is explicitly outside of the scope of ET Docket No. 03-137, the FCC opened a new docket, ET Docket No. 13-84, with the Inquiry to consider these limits in light of more recent developments. The Inquiry is intended to open discussion on both the currency of our RF exposure limits and possible policy approaches regarding RF exposure (<https://www.fcc.gov/encyclopedia/radio-frequency-safety>).

### **International Recognition of Need for More Conservative RF Safety Limits**

Countries around the world are increasingly recognizing the risks of RF radiation and advising action to protect the public ([http://www.cellphonetaskforce.org/?page\\_id=128](http://www.cellphonetaskforce.org/?page_id=128)). Even the U.S., as cited above, is in the process of reviewing RF exposure guidelines. Countries such as China, Russia, Italy and Switzerland already have wireless radiation safety limits 100 times lower than the United States.

The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) recognizes the need to protect vulnerable populations by lowering general exposure levels: “*Different groups in a population may have differences in their ability to tolerate a particular NIR (non-ionizing radiation) exposure. For example, children, the elderly, and some chronically ill people might have a lower tolerance for one or more forms of NIR exposure than the rest of the population. Under such circumstances, it may be useful or necessary to develop separate guideline levels for different groups within the general population, but it may be more effective to adjust the guidelines for the general population to include such groups.*” from ICNIRP Statement, General Approach to Protection Against Non-ionizing Radiation, (HEALTH PHYSICS 82(4):540-548; 2002) <https://www.icnirp.org/documents/philosophy.pdf>

### **Canada: Previous Safety Code 6 Inadequate**

In June 2015, Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee on Health (HESA) issued a report with 12 unanimous recommendations for increased caution, investigations, reporting and data gathering with regard to RF/EMF and wireless devices. Health Canada's Safety Code 6 provided guidelines for RF exposure virtually identical to 1996 FCC guidelines until recently (March 2015) when Canada reduced some of its maximum permissible exposure limits by nearly 50%.

*“The [HESA] Committee agrees that the potential risks of exposure to RF fields are a serious public health issue that needs to be brought to the attention of Canadians so that they have the knowledge to use wireless*

Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

*devices responsibly and are able to make decisions about the use of wireless devices in a manner that protects their health and the health of their families.”*

The Standing Committee report shares themes, including cancer, illness, fertility, autism, public awareness, school environments, and medical responsibilities. It discusses studies demonstrating adverse effects at levels below Health Canada's guidelines

([http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/HOC/Committee/412/HESA/Reports/RP8041315/412\\_HESA\\_Rpt13\\_PDF/412\\_HESA\\_Rpt13-e.pdf](http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/HOC/Committee/412/HESA/Reports/RP8041315/412_HESA_Rpt13_PDF/412_HESA_Rpt13-e.pdf)).

### **World Health Organization (WHO) Scientists Warn of Increased Risk to Public Health**

Increases in microwave radiation exposure caused by planned airborne wireless deployments will be harmful to public health. Wireless technology operates using pulse-modulated microwave radiation: “*The human body*,” says Dr. G.J. Hyland (International Institute of Biophysics, Neuss-Holzheim, Germany), “*is an electrochemical instrument of exquisite sensitivity*,” noting that, “*like a radio, it can be interfered with by incoming radiation*.” If a signal is strong enough to operate a device, it is strong enough to disturb every cell in the human body.

In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), a committee of the WHO, classified RF radiation as a Group 2B carcinogen in the same category as lead, engine exhaust, and DDT. Alarming, several scientists who were members of the IARC working group involved with this classification now conclude the risks are much greater than originally thought. For example, Dr. Dariusz Leszczynski warns that RF-EMF should be classified as a Group 2A carcinogen, and Dr. Lennart Hardell reports that several studies indicate a Group 1 classification is justified, placing RF-EMF in the same category as tobacco, asbestos, and benzene.

Dr. Dariusz Leszczynski MSc, DSc, PhD

<https://betweenrockandhardplace.wordpress.com/2014/08/14/carcinogenicity-of-cell-phone-radiation-2b-or-not-2b/>

*“In conclusion, I consider that currently the scientific evidence is sufficient to classify cell phone radiation as a probable human carcinogen – 2A category in IARC scale. Time will show whether ‘the probable’ will change into ‘the certain’. However, it will take tens of years before the issue is really resolved. In the mean time we should implement the Precautionary Principle. There is a serious reason for doing so.”*

Dr. Lennart Hardell MD, PhD <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24192496>

*“Based on the Hill criteria, glioma and acoustic neuroma should be considered to be caused by RF-EMF emissions from wireless phones and regarded as carcinogenic to humans, classifying it as group 1 according to the IARC classification. Current guidelines for exposure need to be urgently revised.”*

Statements like these support our contention that no new large-scale irradiation of the public should be allowed prior to establishment of biologically protective RF safety limits. In fact, condoning such a project without first updating RF safety limits to be biologically protective of the whole population for the exposures they are likely to experience daily would be in direct violation of the entire Nuremberg Code of Ethics

(<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/archive/nurcode.html>).

### **International Scientists Warn of High Risk and Multigenerational Effects**

The 1,500-page BioInitiative Report on RF/MW health effects was published in 2012. The authors are 29 scientists from 10 countries. They reviewed thousands of studies showing interference with chemical processes in the body, implicating RF/MW in a whole spectrum of alarming effects including genetic damage, cancer, immune dysfunction, neurological injury, and infertility [www.bioinitiative.org](http://www.bioinitiative.org).

More recently, in 2015, over 220 scientists from 41 countries with over 2,000 peer-reviewed journal articles to their collective credit in the field of biological impacts from RF/EMF appealed to the U.N. and the WHO for greater precautions with regard to exposures from wireless technologies. This is the latest in many such alerts to the health effects of RF/EMF exposure <https://www.emfscientist.org/>.

A paper by Microwski, *Electromagnetic Fields: High Level Microwave Technology Concerns* <http://c4st.org/images/documents/wifi-in-schools/doclinks/RFCorrosion,etc-1.pdf> references a study by Magras and Xenos 1997, *RF Radiation-induced Changes in the Prenatal Development of Mice* <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9261543>. The study indicates at environmental wireless exposure levels (0.168  $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$  to 1.053  $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ ) lower than those now commonplace outdoors in Canadian cities such as Metro Toronto, Hamilton, Mississauga, mice become infertile between third and fifth generations.

The continuous exposure to microwave radiation from global wireless, along with that emitted from a myriad of wireless devices, may have implications far greater than we could imagine with nothing less than the continuation of the human race at stake.

## Violation of International Human Rights

5G violates Article 3 of The U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, ratified by the General Assembly in 1948, which states “*everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.*” Data exist showing RF radiation can cause serious biological effects at levels far below the existing FCC RF limits ([www.bioinitiative.org](http://www.bioinitiative.org)). These include damage to DNA which can lead to an increased risk for cancer and deleterious genetic mutations passed on to future generations. Decreases in sperm count and quality and increases in miscarriage and infertility have also been demonstrated in response to exposure to RF radiation. Although much of the recent research focuses on frequencies in WiFi and cellphone ranges, prior research is available showing serious biological effects in the millimeter wavelengths that are being proposed for 5G wireless.

*Observed higher resonance frequencies of a living cell coincide with frequencies of radiation of communications satellites. The power densities and duration of irradiation created by these satellites will significantly exceed (by ten or more orders of magnitude—such irradiation is possible over the course of a whole lifetime) the energetic doses inducing changes in living cells.*

*Negative consequences of this may be changes in cell structures and physiological processes, genetic changes, and alteration of psychophysiological conditions and behavior*  
([http://www.stopglobalwifi.org/documents/2001\\_kositsky\\_et\\_al.\\_-\\_ussr\\_review.pdf](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org/documents/2001_kositsky_et_al._-_ussr_review.pdf)).

More recent scientific publications look specifically at causality, such as M.L. Pall in “*Microwave Frequency Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) Produce Widespread Neuropsychiatric Effects Including Depression*” (J Chem Neuroanat. 2015 Aug 20; <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0891061815000599>). It discusses the causal relationship between exposure to radiation from wireless technology and neuropsychiatric effects. Mechanisms of action are also discussed.

Yakymenko, et al., 2014 discuss the fact that RF radiation is documented in numerous studies to cause oxidative damage and discuss mechanisms (*Low Intensity Radiofrequency Radiation: A New Oxidant for Living Cells*; Oxid Antioxid Med Sci 2014; 3(1):1-3; ([https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269995792\\_Low\\_intensity\\_radiofrequency\\_radiation\\_a\\_new\\_oxidant\\_for\\_living\\_cells](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269995792_Low_intensity_radiofrequency_radiation_a_new_oxidant_for_living_cells))).

A more recent paper by Yakymenko, et al., 2015, *Oxidative Mechanisms of Biological Activity of Low-intensity Radiofrequency Radiation* finds in 93 of 100 reviewed studies a wide pathogenic potential of the induced Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) and their involvement in cell signaling pathways explains a range of biological/health effects of low intensity RF radiation, which include both cancer and non-cancer pathologies.

Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)



Their concluding analysis demonstrates non-thermal RF radiation is an impressive oxidative agent for living cells with a high pathogenic potential and that the oxidative stress induced by RF radiation exposure should be recognized as one of the primary mechanisms of the biological activity of this kind of radiation. (<http://www.mainecoalitiontostopsmartmeters.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Yakymenko-et-al-2015.pdf>)

Lerchl, et. al. in 2015 performed a replication experiment of work done by Tilmann, et. al. in 2010 but increased the number of mice. Their work: *Tumor Promotion by Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields Below Exposure Limits for Humans* found tumors in mice promoted by exposures to levels of RF at below government exposure limits for the use of mobile phones. Numbers of tumors of the lungs and livers in exposed animals were significantly higher than in sham-exposed controls. In addition, lymphomas were also found to be significantly elevated by exposure (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25749340>).

Industry continues to falsely claim that there are no known mechanisms by which the non-ionizing radiation emitted by wireless devices can cause cancer. Oxidants lead to the formation of free radicals. Free radicals may cause DNA breakage and, therefore, cancer. Radiation from wireless devices has been found to cause oxidative damage. Therefore, oxidative damage is one mechanism by which radiation from wireless devices may cause cancer. A recent publication states:

“The rationale, put forward mostly by physicists and accepted by many health agencies, is that, “*since NIR does not have enough energy to dislodge electrons, it is unable to cause cancer.*” This argument is based on a flawed assumption and uses the model of ionizing radiation (IR) to explain NIR, which is inappropriate. Evidence of free-radical damage has been repeatedly documented among humans, animals, plants and microorganisms for both extremely low frequency (ELF) electromagnetic fields (EMF) and for radio frequency (RF) radiation, neither of which is ionizing.” (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.10.018>)

Replicated double-blind studies show that a cordless phone base station operating at WiFi frequencies can cause cardiac arrhythmias in susceptible individuals (<http://www.magdahavas.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Havas-HRV-Ramazzini.pdf> and [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23675629#](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23675629#)).

Flooding the globe with radiation that can have such a serious, even deadly effect, is unethical. A study in rabbits found that not only did WiFi change heart function parameters, but it dramatically changed the cardiac effects of both dopamine and epinephrine: Saili L, et al. *Effects of Acute Exposure to WIFI Signals (2.45 GHz) on Heart Variability and Blood Pressure in Albinos Rabbit*. Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology 40 (2015) 600–605; (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1382668915300594>). Therefore, ubiquitous RF radiation may not only cause cardiac emergencies, but prevent treatments from working and cause deaths. The threat to cardiac health is also supported by epidemiological studies showing increased death from cardiac events and heart disease - Criticism of the Health Assessment in the ICNIRP Guidelines for Radiofrequency and Microwave Radiation (100 kHz - 300 GHz) ([www.electricalpollution.com/documents/Cherry2000EMR\\_ICNIRP\\_critique\\_09-02.pdf](http://www.electricalpollution.com/documents/Cherry2000EMR_ICNIRP_critique_09-02.pdf)).

Forced exposure to an agent that has the effects discussed above and enumerated in the resources listed above would have to be considered a violation of the Nuremberg Code of Ethics (<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/archive/nurcode.html>). 5G would force such an exposure.

Furthermore, 5G wireless proposals violate Article 25 of International Human Rights (1), which states, “*Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.*”

Exposure to an agent that disrupts hormones, sleep, cardiac and neurological function, and has forced numerous people from their homes and into poverty is an obvious violation of numerous fundamental rights which are to be universally protected according to The U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.

## Violation of U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child

Under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, states/countries are responsible for acting in their children's best interest. In this case, that would mean halting implementation of 5G wireless, pending medical-grade safety testing.

In a letter to Congress, the American Academy of Pediatrics stated:

*"Children are disproportionately affected by environmental exposures, including cell phone radiation. The differences in bone density and the amount of fluid in a child's brain compared to an adult's brain could allow children to absorb greater quantities of RF energy deeper into their brains than adults."*  
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7520941318>

Please watch this video clip (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yYDmIq-nTn4>) which includes imaging evidence of the increased penetration by RF radiation into children bodies.

No child should be forced to be exposed to RF radiation and therefore forced to incur an increased risk of cancer, functional impairment leading to ill health or cognitive impairment, or genetic damage in *their* children.

Any of these outcomes, which research supports as likely, violate children's rights. Electromagnetic Radiation, Health and Children 2014 by Dr. Erica Mallery-Blythe (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sNFdZVeXw7M>) is a must-watch presentation about the hazard that RF radiation emitted by wireless technology poses to children.

Dr. Mallery-Blythe's presentation references several U.N. Conventions on the Rights of the Child that would be violated by this project including:

Article 3 (best interests of a child) The best interests of a child must be a top priority in all decisions and actions that affect children.

Article 23 (children with a disability) A child with a disability has the right to live a full and decent life with dignity, and, as far as possible, independence and to play an active part in the community. Governments must do all that they can to support disabled children and their families.

Article 24 (health and services) Every child has the right to the best possible health. Governments must provide good quality health care, clean water, nutritious food and a clean environment and education on health and well-being so that children can stay healthy

Article 28 (right to education) Every child has a right to education.

A Brief from the Canadian Teachers' Federation, *The Use of WiFi in Schools* (2014), warns, "*Teachers and school communities have not been informed regarding the implementation of WiFi and any inherent potential hazards*" and goes on to share, "*Teachers are rightly concerned for their personal safety and the safety of the children in their care*" (<http://www.ctf-fce.ca/Research-Library/wifi-final-2014-ENG.pdf>).

Schools, unions and PTAs worldwide have issued statements, enacted policy and are calling for safer, wired technology in schools to address this unprecedented health disaster (<http://ehtrust.org/policy/schools-unions-and-pta-actions/>).

## Violation of U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Increasing numbers of countries, such as Sweden and France, (as do the Canadian Human Rights Commission and European Parliament) recognize Electrohypersensitivity (EHS) as an environmentally induced functional impairment or disability triggered by exposure to electromagnetic fields (including RF). Continental or global WiFi would contravene: Article 1 “*promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity*”; Article 3 “*Full and effective participation and inclusion in society*”; Article 15(2) states: “*Parties shall take all effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent persons with disabilities, on an equal basis with others, from being subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*”; and violate the intent of many more Articles, since the planet would be blanketed with microwave radiation that those suffering EHS could not escape.

The European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) is an E.U. advisory body comprising representatives of workers’ and employers’ organizations and other interest groups. It issues opinions on E.U. issues to the European Commission, the Council of the E.U., and the European Parliament, thus acting as a bridge between the E.U.’s decision-making institutions and E.U. citizens. In February 2015, a formal letter of notice was sent to the EESC by the Radiation Research Trust (based in U.K.) and approximately 90 other organizations from around the world in support of millions of people, estimated to be between 22,000,000 and 37,000,000 throughout Europe currently suffering EHS due to exposure to the proliferation of RF emissions and emitters (i.e., mobile phones, DECT cordless phones, cordless baby monitors, phone masts, WiFi, smart meters, the smart grid, et al.) ([http://www.radiationresearch.org/images/rtr\\_articles/EM-Radiation-Research-Trust-Letter-of-Notice-Served-on-Mr-Richard-Adams.pdf](http://www.radiationresearch.org/images/rtr_articles/EM-Radiation-Research-Trust-Letter-of-Notice-Served-on-Mr-Richard-Adams.pdf)).

Canadians For Safe Technology (C4ST) points out, “*EHS is accepted as a functional impairment in Sweden and the Canadian Human Rights Commission recognizes it as an environmental sensitivity and classifies it as a disability.*” With some countries already recognizing the medical needs of those affected by EHS and the potential for millions of people around the world to suffer EHS from increased exposure to radiation from wireless technology, further proliferation of wireless technology on a wide scale is unacceptable.

Jenny Fry (age 15) hanged herself when her school refused to understand that being in classrooms with WiFi caused her to experience serious physical discomfort and harassed and bullied her by requiring her to serve detentions for leaving classes due to WiFi induced symptoms in rooms where she experienced intense functional impairment (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/school-girl-found-hanged-after-suffering-from-allergy-to-wifi-a6755401.html>).

International Human Rights, Article 26 states that “(1) *Everyone has the right to education.*” People with disabilities and functional impairments like Jenny’s have a right to go to school in an environment free from RF radiation, in a school that will not make them sick. Her rights, like the rights of all those experiencing this type of functional impairment, should be protected under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Many other persons experience similar functional impairment when exposed to RF radiation: “How We Are Killing Ourselves - Wireless Radiation” (Hebrew) (<http://reshet.tv/Shows/specialsreshet/vml,315/>), “WiFi in Schools: How Safe” (<http://www.publicnewsservice.org/2014-09-22/health-issues/wifi-in-schools-how-safe/a41810-1>), and “Maryland woman suffers acute radiation exposure from a bank of smart meters” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?x-yt-cl=84503534&x-yt-ts=1421914688&v=F9QZuWPw6Y0>).

**European Academy for Environmental Medicine Recommends Minimizing EMF Exposure to Protect Public Health and Allow Previously Injured Individuals to Fully Participate in Society**  
The EUROPAEM EMF Guideline 2016 for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of EMF-related health problems and illnesses (<https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/reveh.ahead-of-print/reveh-2016-0011/reveh-2016-0011.xml?format=INT>) states, “*Studies, empirical observations, and patient reports clearly indicate interactions between EMF exposure and health problems.*” The Guideline is clear that in treating individuals experiencing health problems related to EMF exposure, including from radiation emitted by wireless technology, the preferred

Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

treatment is to eliminate exposure—“*The primary method of treatment should mainly focus on the prevention or reduction of EMF exposure, that is, reducing or eliminating all sources of high EMF exposure at home and at the workplace.*” The authors reiterate and support the statement by Hedendahl, Carlberg, and Hardell that “*It is time to consider ELF EMF and RF EMF as environmental pollutants that need to be controlled.*”

## Insurance Companies Warn of Large Losses Due To Electromagnetic Fields

We also note that insurance in the event of injury due to RF/MW radiation is not likely to be adequate – see pages 1 and 2 in the document at the following link:

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/591391.pdf>

Stop Smart Meters UK shares that: “*Insurance Firm, Swiss Re, Warns of Large Losses from “Unforeseen Consequences” of Wireless Technologies*: <http://stopsmartmeters.org.uk/insurance-firm-swiss-re-warns-of-large-losses-from-unforeseen-health-claims-due-to-wireless-technologies/> (Source: swissre.com)

Specialists from the Emerging Risks team at leading global reinsurance firm, Swiss Re, are warning the insurance industry that “unforeseen consequences of electromagnetic fields” could lead to a raft of claims and significant product liability losses in the next 10 years.

In its Swiss Re SONAR Emerging Risks report, 2013, which covers risks that could “*impact the insurance industry in the future*”, the company categorizes the impact of health claims related to electromagnetic fields (EMFs) as ‘high’. It acknowledges recent reports of courts’ ruling in favor of claimants who have experienced health damage from mobile phones, and also says that anxiety over risks related to EMFs is “on the rise”.

The document states that whilst the majority of the topics covered in its pages were of “medium impact”, health issues associated with EMFs sit in the highest impact category. Other topics discussed include the dangers of cyber attacks, power blackouts, workplace safety and Big Data all of which are exacerbated and/or added to with the ill-conceived society-wide dependence on wireless technology.

Lloyd’s listed hazards from new technologies including EMF in its 2011 Top 50 Risks. Coverage for RF/EMF injuries typically related to cell phones and cell towers is now categorically excluded. In their 2013 Risk Report, new technology risks have increased slightly in risk rank. It is worth noting these risks are classified under Environmental (i.e., does the applicant expect to have an adverse environmental impact?) as distinct from the Lloyd’s appraisal of cybersecurity risks (also applicable to 5G wireless and rated much higher risk).

<http://www.lloyds.com/~media/Files/News%20and%20Insight/Risk%20Insight/Risk%20Index%202013/Report/Lloyds%20Risk%20Index%202013report100713.pdf>

GUARDS asserts that 5G would intensify these concerns.

## Conclusion

The serious environmental damage that 5G wireless would do necessitates a thorough NEPA review and EIS. So do the serious human health consequences that implementation of 5G would entail.

Furthermore, if the FCC decides to move forward with preempting local zoning to force expedited deployment of 5G, they should allow cities and municipalities to charge fees for their right-of-ways that cover all the projected costs the distributed antenna systems will inflict upon them. These should include, but not be limited to: decreased property values, increased health care costs, increased disability and associated costs, decreased productivity from missed or substandard work performance, lost or compromised ecological services and agricultural harm from RF-EMF exposure, all of which could cost municipalities billions of dollars. Not only is RF-EMF proliferation bad for health and the environment directly, this damage has a major economic cost as well. Telecommunications business should be required to pay for those costs. Taxpayers should not be forced to

**Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space**

[www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

subsidize the highly lucrative telecommunication industry.

Please consider our comments as reasons to halt implementation of 5G wireless. In brief, those reasons include: environmental damage, insurance industry recognition of serious risk to health, cyber and national security, demonstrated detrimental biological effects at levels far below existing inadequate RF safety limits, radiofrequency radiation currently classified “*possible human carcinogen*” by the World Health Organization, results from the U.S. National Toxicology Program finding RF radiation breaks DNA and causes cancer, legal implications related to irradiating the entire population without informed consent, and resultant violations of U.N. Conventions and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

5G wireless, with all its serious safety problems, is an unacceptable hazard. Widely available fast internet access is a goal that can be safely attained using various forms of cabled connectivity.

GUARDS respectfully requests the FCC deny the request for expedited installation of distributed antenna systems and halt implementation of 5G wireless pending a thorough NEPA review, EIS, and results of medical-style safety testing.

Sincerely,



Ed Friedman  
42 Stevens Rd.  
Bowdoinham, ME 04008  
207-666-3372  
[edfomb@comcast.net](mailto:edfomb@comcast.net)

Marcey Kliparchuk  
10859-147 Street  
Edmonton, AB, Canada, T5N 3E1  
780-760-0872  
[marcey.klip@yahoo.ca](mailto:marcey.klip@yahoo.ca)

*GUARDS is an international coalition against global WiFi from space, a complex technology of radiation and toxic chemicals endangering all life on Earth.*